

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed July 20, 2004 having a shortened statutory response period ending on October 20, 2004. This response is filed within the statutory response period. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 02-1818.

Claims 1-3, 7-16 and 92-95 are currently pending in the application. Claims 9, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the English abstract of Japanese patent reference JP 53075278A (the '*278 reference*'). Claims 1-3, 7 and 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the '*278 reference*'. Claims 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the '*278 reference*'. Claims 92-95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the '*278 reference*' and the English abstract of German Auslegeschrift DE 1,234,019 to Hines et al. (*Hines*). Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections as the '*278 reference*' and *Hines*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in the present claims.

The '*278 reference*' fails to teach or suggest a polymer blend composed of a first and a second polybutadiene as recited in the present claims. Rather, the '*278 reference*' merely lists several monomers that may be selected to form a resin blend. This list includes polybutadiene. See '*278 reference*', abstract, p. 402. The '*278 reference*', however, has no disclosure whatsoever directed to a polymeric blend that actually includes a polybutadiene, not to mention a polymeric blend composed of two polybutadienes as recited in the present claims. Indeed, neither the English abstract, the specification, nor the examples of the '*278 reference*' disclose a polymeric blend containing polybutadiene. As the '*278 reference*' fails to disclose a blend that includes a polybutadiene, the '*278 reference*' simply cannot teach or suggest a blend that includes two polybutadienes as recited in the present claims.

When viewed as a whole, *Hines* actually teaches away from a blend of two polybutadienes as recited in the present claims. *Hines*, discloses a polymer crosslinking process having increased efficiency, the process including adding a small amount of perfluoroolefin resin to a polymer in order to accelerate crosslinking upon exposure of a polymer-perfluoroolefin blend to irradiation. *Hines*, col. 1 line 18 through col. 2 line 32. Consequently, *Hines* has no disclosure whatsoever of a two-polybutadiene blend and actually teaches away from the same by disclosing a blend composed of perfluoroolefin and a butadiene polymer. *Hines*, col. 1 lines 35-49.

Neither reference discloses a blend composed of two polybutadienes. The '*278 reference*' fails to disclose a blend that contains a polybutadiene. *Hines*' perfluoroolefin-butadiene blend teaches away from a two-polybutadiene blend. Thus, the '*278 reference*' and *Hines*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in the present claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-3, 7-16 and 92-95 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request early notice thereof.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

Date: October 20, 2004

BY 

Robert M. Barrett, Reg. No. 30,142
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4204